DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 742 CS 202 328

AUTHOR Ellis, W. Geiger; And Others
TITLE The University of Georgia Teacher Education Program in English. Studies in Language Education Report No. 22.
INSTITUTION Georgia Univ., Athens. Dept. of Language Education.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; *English Education; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

The four sections in this booklet describe a teacher education program in English at the University of Georgia by outlining the program, describing the three major on-campus courses and field center experiences, and summarizing the evaluation plan. The first section describes such topics as the students in the program, the major functions of the program, major coursework and professional training, and the field experience sequence. The second section discusses preparing undergraduate students by providing English courses which are good background for teaching. The third section discusses some of the problems involved in establishing a field-based training program in public school centers. The fourth and final section discusses various evaluation instruments for the program, including the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, Conference Observation Forms, Departmental English Education Test, and Teacher-Candidate Program Evaluation. (TS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113742

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM IN ENGLISH

Developed by the
Secondary English Committee

W. Geiger Ellis, Chairman
W. Hugh Agee
Emily B. Gregory
Dan Kirby
Angelia Moore
Roy C. O'Donnell
Amy Pace
William [illegible] Smith
L. Ramon Veal

Studies in Language Education, Report No. 22
Department of Language Education, The University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

CS 202 328

PREFACE

This program was made possible by the cooperative blending and sharing of expertise by all members of the Secondary English Committee. Our initial planning efforts began in 1972, and the first pilot field work was undertaken the following year.

Ramon Veal was head of the Department of Language Education during the period of the program's development and implementation. Indeed, it was he who urged the committee to proceed in this direction. All the other members of the Secondary English Committee have participated in nearly every aspect of this undertaking.

Authorship of the various sections of this report reflect areas of major responsibility for some individuals, yet equally important contributions were made by the committee members whose names do not appear at the head of one of the sections. Emily Gregory was largely responsible for the development of our course in composition and has worked with teacher-candidates in field centers. Roy O'Donnell has been the major force in shaping our language study component and is currently head of the department. Amy Pace joined us last year to establish and coordinate a new field center in Atlanta. Bill Smith did the preliminary work in establishing relationships for that center and developed our course in language studies.

It is impossible to cite all the contributions of each individual when the work has been done so completely in the spirit of cooperation. It was this sense of common mission which made the sharing of work an unquestioned procedure. Hence, the responsibility and recognition for

this work are likewise distributed. This experience has been one of the most rewarding and enriching professional experiences each of us has known.

Athens, Georgia
October 1975

W.G.E.

INTRODUCTION

L. Ramon Veal

This series of articles is an effort to focus attention on a particular approach to teacher education. It also reflects a dominant feature of our program and one we wish to emphasize. All of our thinking, work, and planning have been done in light of our total program in English education. Thus, even though we highlight our teacher-center concept and activities at some length, we are in fact reviewing "The University of Georgia teacher education program in English."

The University of Georgia teacher-center idea grew out of our involvement with the Competency-Based Teacher Education movement. Anyone considering CBTE today must regard it first as a slogan for any number of things and only then as a particular systematic approach to teacher education. For us, too, it is a slogan, but it also implies certain features that are sometimes associated with CBTE--cooperative efforts, individualized instruction, specification of objectives, performance evaluation, and some "modularized" instruction. We make no claim, however, to being a full-fledged CBTE program. No single notion or feature of CBTE is really more important than any other for us, except our practice of working cooperatively in a field center with a department head and a group of teachers. This feature can be seen as only a recent innovation, as an outgrowth of traditional student teaching, or as a new version of a laboratory school. For us, CBTE and field centers are associated.

Historically, and as a practical matter, CBTE came to Georgia via federal funding and our elementary division. Our secondary programs

received no special funding--only what we call "moral" support. In fact, the College of Education Executive Committee said in 1970 we would move in this direction as soon as possible*. What we present in the next sections indicates our specific interpretation or redefinition of what CBTE is, particularly in terms of field center operations as they have evolved since the 1972-73 school year.

An understanding of programs in our department requires some knowledge of our special relationships: First, our department as a unit within the College of Education, and then our department in connection with other units--public schools, other College of Education departments, and Arts and Sciences departments.

We may have a special advantage in that Language Education for us includes not only (as some immediately guess) foreign language teacher education, but it also includes secondary English and speech and elementary language arts (including children's literature). Responsibility for planning these programs rests with us; therefore, we can specify what we require in these areas.

In secondary English, though we work through a college-wide Council on Basic Studies, we have direct responsibility for the program. As a department, we are charged with planning a program for secondary English teachers; but, as the following papers show, we have considerable latitude as to how much we include, require, and provide ourselves. Whether one or two "methods" courses, whether or not to use field centers and provide certain other courses (such as adolescent literature) and, in large measure which literature and language courses to require are our decisions. In

---

*Southern Association Evaluation Report, 1970

planning our programs, we make use of advisory committees composed of students, classroom teachers, and representatives from related departments; so we do nct work in isolation. The responsibility, however, for determining if a "reading" course is to be required and if it is to be provided in a school setting is ours. In such a case we would initiate the negotiations with the Reading Department about such an offering. The same is true in establishing field centers. That is, we have generally been able to get them set up through direct negotiations between us and a high school department head, although we have an office of student teaching and various school system administrative offices to work through. And, though they sometimes seem to provide an unnecessary administrative step, they can often help very much and they must be officially informed.

Of course, all is not smooth and easy, since on occasion it has taken a university vice-president to resolve a conflict between us and another department. Sometimes schedule juggling is necessary, as when we are not very happy with a teacher-student assignment set up in a school or when a school asks that some other University person come next time. Whatever, though, the current operation of our program is the result of three years of planning and experience.

The following four sections, in order, outline our total program, describe our three major on-campus courses and field center experiences, and, finally, summarize our evaluation plan.

WHAT IS IT, AND HOW DID IT GET THAT WAY?

W. Geiger Ellis

The planning of this program, which has been in operation for two years, involved public school teachers, undergraduate and graduate students in English education, and the Secondary English Committee of the Department of Language Education at the University of Georgia. Besides both formal and informal on-campus meetings, we staged retreats of two or three days duration for brainstorming and intensive planning sessions. Rather than limiting ourselves by real or imagined obstacles, we concocted what we thought would be an ideal program. Then we set about fighting the political battles and enlisting the cooperation of all agencies touched by our proposal. What is so amazing is how close we have been able to come to our ideal rather than the number of obstacles we encountered, although the latter have at times been formidable.

The program itself begins with the usual broad general education for two years, including four basic English courses in composition and literature. Sometime, usually during a student's second or third year, a student will have his first field experience working as a teacher aide in a public school for ten hours a week as part of an introduction to education course handled by another department in the College of Education. Another feature of that course is a human relations training component conducted by the Counseling Department. A major function of this course is screening, much of it self-screening by students, but also including evaluations by public school personnel and College of Education personnel. Reports are sent to us on students who declare English as their chosen teaching field.

The third and fourth years are devoted to major coursework and professional training. The minimum requirement in major is 50 quarter hours. The division of work requires at least two courses in language, four in literature, and one in composition.

MAJOR COURSES

1. History of the English Language
2. English Language Studies
3. British Literature (non-20th Century)
4. American Literature (non-20th Century)
5. Twentieth Century Literature
6. Literature Study in the Secondary School
7. Composition
8. Elective
9. Elective
10. Elective

{Literature, Speech, Journalism, Drama, for example.}

The remainder may be selected to expand any of these areas or to pursue some specialty such as journalism or drama. Three of the required courses--English Language Studies, Literature Study in the Secondary Schools, and Comrosition--are taught in the Department of Language Education. These courses, referred to as Capstone Courses, will be explained more fully in the next section.

The concentrated professional training is called the Advanced Professional Education Sequence, or the APES. Students are selected on the basis of specified criteria:

Overall GPA of 2.5
Major GPA of 2.5
Completion of 7 major courses
Informal professional evaluations, which are done by the instructors in each of the three Capstone Courses.

The APES itself is the field center operation which lasts two quarters. During the first of these, the teacher-candidates (as they are now designated) are enrolled in courses in the teaching of reading in secondary schools and

psychology, both taught on-site in the public school by instructors from those departments. However, all this work is done under the coordination of the English education center coorinator, who also conducts the curriculum and methods seminar which lasts for both quarters. Enrollment during the second quarter includes the traditional student-teaching course numbers.

F I E L D S E Q U E N C E (THE APES)

FIRST QUARTER	SECOND QUARTER
5 Qtr. Hrs. Teaching Reading in Secondary Schools	5 Qtr. Hrs. Student Teaching
5 Qtr. Hrs. Educational Psychology	5 Qtr. Hrs. Student Teaching
5 Qtr. Hrs.	5 Qtr. Hrs.
Seminar in English Curriculum and Methods	

This arrangement of enrollments is for the convenience of the Registrar's Office; it is not an accurate indicator of the distribution of work, for teacher-candidates are engaged in some teaching during both quarters. However, the instruction in reading and educational psychology are to be completed during the first quarter.

The sequence of activities for the teacher-candidates during the two quarters proceeds at the individual teacher-candidate's own pace through phases, which are not discrite. Judgements about the pacing for individual teacher-candidates are jointly arrived at by the supervising teachers and the English education coordinator.

FIELD EXPERIENCE SEQUENCE

PHASE	PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES
I	Clerical Duties and Observations
II	Tutoring
III	Small-Group Instruction plus Occasional Days with a Total Class
IV	Solo Teaching (Full Load, Full Time)
V (Optional)	Peer-Teaching

There is a fairly comprehensive list of guidelines for operating field cneters, but some of the most important guides for the teacher-candidates are these:

1. All work is off campus, with the exception of a brief orientation period and perhaps a few concluding seminars.
2. Some work is to be done in both a middle school and a high school.
3. Follow the public school schedule of workdays and holidays.
4. Attend weekly seminars.
5. Work with two cooperating teachers during Phase IV.
6. Solo teaching experience must be with a variety of student ability levels.
7. Solo teaching experience must include work with students in grades 8, 9, or 10.

A guide to field center operation that cannot be listed simply, but which is probably the most important, is that decisions--both day-to-day and overall--about field center operations must be made jointly by public school personnel and the English education coordinator. It has been our experience that the key public school person on whom the success of this program is dependent is the English department head. With a good one, you'll fly. Without a good one, you had better find another school or a different program.

HOW DO YOU GET THEM READY?

Hugh Agee

Undergraduate students preparing to teach English take a variety of courses in English which provide background for teaching. There are three capstone courses, however, which provide specific knowledge and training for the field center experiences of students. These are: Literature Study in the Secondary School, English Language Studies for Teachers, and Teaching Composition in the Schools. My charge is to convey something of the general nature of this familiar triumvirate, which is to say, in effect, something of our departmental philosophy about the teaching of English.

Literature Study in the Secondary School is a unique course in that it provides the only opportunity English majors have to read and discuss transitional literature for adolescents. One of the basic course objectives is to identify a large body in literature appropriate for use in secondary schools. This is achieved through a variety of resources: Dwight Burton's LITERATURE STUDY IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS, Robert Carlsen's BOOKS AND THE TEEN-AGE READER, BOOKS FOR YOU, the ENGLISH JOURNAL, the ARIZONA ENGLISH BULLETIN, etc. There follows the in-depth study of certain representative novels, and here the titles vary. For example, we might use OLD YELLER or SWIFTWATER in the animal book category; ACROSS FIVE APRILS or APRIL MORNING may be the historical fiction choice.

The junior novel is not the dominant genre, however. Poetry, drama, and the short story all receive special emphasis. One primary task in dealing with poetry is to lead our students to a broad view of the range of topics and forms that characterize contemporary poetry, and to promote

via material from Alan Purves and others a response-centered approach to poetry in the classroom.

Our treatment of drama transcends the more traditional reading and studying of plays. We reflect somewhat Moffett's influence and attempt to show the wide possibilities for student involvement, not only for literature study but also for language development and affective growth through readers theatre, role-playing, mime, improvisation, etc.

The short story is a basic tool in the English class, and we give considerable attention to the ways it may be used. Dramatization enters here also with readers theatre and other adaptations.

Basic to all of the above is the necessity of planning for literature study which takes into account a wide range of needs, abilities, and interests. In addition, we stress the advantages of multi-media approaches to literature study through film, slide-tape shows, and the like. We also underscore the relevance to literature study of some background knowledge of folklore, mythology, and the Bible. Then, too, we focus on issues, problems, and alternatives related to censorship in the English classroom. One activity students engage in is the writing of a rationale for teaching a potentially censorable piece of literature.

English Language Studies strives to broaden students' conception of the nature of language so they can generate in their teaching learning experiences most beneficial to the language development of their students. Thus, students are prepared to teach in terms of what we know about language rather than to teach grammar per se.

This course is organized around two broad topics: language description (grammar) and language variation. (I would add here a reminder that our

students also take a course in history of the English language). Under language description come the topics phonetics and phonology, semantics, and syntax. Under language variation come the topics age, regional and social dialects, argot, jargon, and language register. In both segments there is a general concern for the application of this knowledge to classroom activities.

Other activities include the review of language studies in specific areas of interest to the students, plus a project that applies a language principle, concept, or idea to classroom activities.

Our course in Teaching Composition calls for much student writing as a means of sharpening their writing skills, as well as getting them into a variety of composition strategies which they may incorporate in their teaching plans later as these develop. These activities support, therefore, a basic course objective, which is to identify stages in the composition process and to relate these to the development of a sequential program for the teaching of composition. We use the term composition in the broadest sense, including not only the written word but oral composition, nonverbal composition, and multimedia composition.

Course topics include pre-composing activities, journal writing, media as stimuli for composing, the use of models, programmed materials, writing in response to literature, considerations of style, and approaches to the evaluation of student writing. In the latter we discuss the procedures for determining appropriate criteria for evaluating compositions, peer response to student writing, evaluation scales, and strategies for marking and grading when they are so dictated.

Essentially, these experiences help each student develop his own philosophy of composition teaching through which he comes to perceive his role as teacher in the overall process.

We are continually evaluating these courses both through standardized student course evaluations which reflect course and teacher effectiveness, and through overall program evaluations which put the courses in perspective. In general, while there is always room for improvement, we do get favorable feedback from our students. It has been noted in the field center that students who come through an A.B. program and who do not take all of these courses tend to have more problems in planning for instruction and relating to the needs of secondary students. In short, these courses are most essential to the preparation of prospective teachers of English.

HOW DO YOU DO IT AND LIVE TO TELL ABOUT IT

Dan Kirby

The problems involved in the establishing of a field-based training program in public school centers are the same problems inherent in the establishing of any genuine relationship. The key to achieving this kind of genuine relationship is to arrive at an accommodation--a comfortable living relationship among all members of the enterprise. Coming to that accommodation is not easy; however, quick and dirty solutions which compromise university or high school programs will eventually destroy both.

The most obvious initial problem the university person faces is the overcoming of the stereotypes and preconceived ideas of the school teachers themselves. Public school teachers like the old "I've got a student teacher of my own" concept and are reluctant to work in the less secure, less structured ways in which a field center must inevitably be run. From the university point of view, we want maximum flexibility in the scheduling of training experiences: We want to be able to move our teacher-candidates around, let them see a variety of teaching styles, and let them work in a number of short-term situations initially; reminding them to keep a tentative and open opinion of all that they observe. Wide exposure--the big picture--seems essential to create the kind of initial dissonance within the teacher-candidates which can promote lasting growth. But all of this coming and going is distressing to the public school teachers. They want someone they can "count on." They want "my student teacher."

In the past some opportunistic school teachers have dumped their unpleasant classes on "my student teacher" and headed for the teachers'

lounge, but I don't think many school teachers really abuse "their student teacher." I think this desire to own some rookie student-teacher comes rather from the human need to "control" or to act as knowledgeable initiator of some innocent novice. The whole relationship has really served to lift the public teacher one notch on the informal status ladder and teachers are always happy to engage in any experience which lifts them off the bottom. At its best, the old system of assigning a student-teacher to a professional teacher approached the master-apprentice model; albeit the teacher's attitude was often the "I have so many things to tell you" approach. At its worst the system was a kind of blind leading blind with the professional teacher's cynicism forcing her to try to extinguish the fragile flame of idealism within the student teacher by showing the "real world of teaching" and discounting those "education courses" which suggested new and threatening ways to organize the classroom.

But public teachers are reasonable people--cautious but reasonable. So the English department chairman (your friend--you hope!) calls his teachers together for a 3:30 meeting and introduces you as Dr. DooDah from the university. Immediately the teachers feel let down. They had hoped the chairman was going to announce the hiring of a new English teacher and the commensurate lessening of the crowding in their classrooms. The Dr. DooDah pushes ahead; asks for the teachers' help in establishing a new kind of teacher training model. Instinctively the university person slips into the educational jargon and begins talking about goals and objectives, program management, demonstrated competencies. At this point Dr. DooDah has already lost his audience, their 3:40 teacher-fatigued

minds are already clicking off the things they want "my student teacher" to do; or the left-overs in the refrigerator they might warm for dinner.

Ask them at another time, another place, and they'll tell you they are interested in helping to train new teachers. Even then, however, the "what's in it for me?" question is uppermost in their thinking. The question is a valid one and one which university people must find a satisfactory answer to if this accommodation mentioned earlier is to be achieved. To begin talking about new training models and detailing in educational jargon the role of the professional sounds too much like someone from the State Department of Education, and this is an image to be avoided at all costs. Beginning contacts with the professionals must focus on the "what's in it for me?" question, and the answer to that question must include something more substantial than status.

The idea of competencies bothers them too. School teachers instinctively link up that term with the hated accountability movement. This fear, of course, is that they as teachers may have to prove themselves--again; that they might be placed in the absurd position of giving rational defenses for the coping strategies they have evolved to survive in the chaos of the schools. Worse, they might have to defend their absurd positions to people who have forgotten that it is absurd. The university person must not put these teachers on the defensive; this undermines the morale of the whole program. I learned early to treat teachers as the professionals they are: call them professionals; honestly seek their questions and perceptions; give them decision-level powers of controlling their part in the program (even to the option of not participating in it at all--without prejudice) and above all to avoid becoming defensive myself when pressed by the exercise of their professional prerogatives.

"In plain terms, what is my role in the new program?" a decidedly candid teacher asks. "I mean, I'm not sure I'm always going to be a perfect model: I get mad or impatient; I come down on my kids sometimes, and I know you university professors don't like that." Many teachers are conscious of their influence over the novice teacher-candidate. I try to assure them that they are models, yes, but not the model and they must be led to see their role more as the experience engineer: posing meaningful trials for the teacher-candidates, then helping the teacher-candidate to work through her own feelings about the trial and to arrive at a personalized evaluation rather than to demand that the teacher-candidate approximate some "right method." The professional teacher needs to be encouraged to withhold a priori aphorisms so as to open up the range of discoveries which the teacher-candidate might make. The professional also needs to be encouraged to discover some of the joys of teaching anew and to revalidate her own perceptions of and hopes for the classroom through this trial and error period with the teacher-candidate.

That accommodation we're looking for between the university and professional teachers comes through the building of a supportive community of concerned professionals who are secure with each other, who know they have expertise to give and room for growth. Building this kind of community is like the building of any lasting relationship: It's a personal thing.

The university personnel must have no delusions about their own uniqueness. A teachers' lounge is too crowded a place to worry about tripping over professorial egos. Pulling rank when the pressure is on is the surest way for the university to destroy the developing spirit of the community. (Sermon for university types: A Ph.D. and a bag of tricks may get you in the door; but the successful training program calls for a

long-term living relationship. Day-to-day exposure with a snake-oil salesman is tiresome even for the true-believers). Admitting mistakes, admitting uncertainties, admitting prejudices and hang-ups are all initial steps in the building of that community and the establishing of the "personal" quality essential to that community.

But true accommodation cannot be achieved at the expense of anyone's interests: high school students, professional teachers, university teachers, university teacher-candidates or public school administrators. The university representative is primarily responsible for the soundness of the training program--ideally a sequential and meaningful set of instructional experiences, carefully organized and personally evaluated. Sacrificing these essentials to attain accommodation is inconsistent with the interests of all. These training experiences in the field center must be co-authored by all of the participants, but the university must insist on a set of experiences which are consistent with program objectives.

How do you do it and live to tell about it?

(1) You make field centers your number one priority.

(2) You allocate university resources of staff time and money so that university personnel can give the field center a <u>full time effort</u>.

(3) You meet public school teachers on their terms and make them feel good about their part in the training program.

(4) And you settle in to build a long-term, people-centered training program which can not only produce well-prepared teachers but also serve to strengthen and support public school teachers.

WHAT MAKES YOU THINK YOU DID IT?

Angelia Moore

Although student evaluations of the secondary English education program had been gathered consistently prior to the institution of the new program, the difference between evaluations for student-teachers in the traditional program and those from teacher-candidates in the field centers led to attempts for a more thorough program evaluation. These efforts began with a review of the Program and Course Description of the Secondary English Committee. Through a series of interviews with members of the Secondary English Committee, a new list of goals and objectives was compiled. These goals and objectives relate to the various components of the total program already presented, but of primary concern are the goals and objectives relating to the capstone courses and to the Advanced Professional Education Sequence.

The next step was to find or develop instruments to evaluate attainment of these goals and objectives. Two types of instruments were used. First, there were attitudinal inventories and the combined classroom observations, which served as criterion measures. Secondly, there were instruments based on favorable versus unfavorable responses; these may indicate specific weaknesses in the preparation program.

MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY (MTAI)

The MTAI is administered during the first capstone course and again at the end of the APES. In the words of its authors:

> It is designed to measure those attitudes of a teacher which predict how well he will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships, and indirectly how well satisfied he will be with teaching as a

> vocation. The most direct use to which the MTAI can be put is in the selection of students for teacher preparation and the selection of students for teaching positions. A parallel use of the Inventory may possibly be extended to other areas, such as measuring the effictiveness of a teacher-education program... (Cook, Leeds, and Challis, 1971, p. 3)

The use of the MTAI as a measure of effectiveness of the teacher-education program is based on the assumption that there is some agreement on the kinds of attitudes that underlie effective teaching. Loree discusses three types of attitudinal objectives which recur in objectives for teacher education programs, including the objectives of this program. Those objectives are the teacher's attitude toward himself, the teacher's concern with human relationships, and the teacher's concern with human relationships, and the teacher's concern with the teaching-learning process (Loree, 1971, pp. 100-102). Items in the MTAI are designed to assess attitudes through responses to a number of statements that constitute beliefs or feelings about pupil-teacher relationships. The validity of the MTAI is confirmed by its ability to distinguish teachers who have been identified by principals as having particularly good or poor relationships with pupils. Since those identified characteristics of teachers having good relationships with pupils are consistent with the goals and objectives of the English education program, the MTAI is a valid insturment for this evaluation.

FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATION ORIENTATION--BEHAVIOR (FIRO-B)

The author of the FIRO-B asserts that it is "A measure of a person's characteristic behavior toward other people in the areas of inclusion, control and affection" (Schutz, 1967, p. 3). Two of the attitudinal objectives related specifically to the APES include the teacher's attitude toward himself and the teacher's relationships with others. The FIRO-B is

used to measure changes in these attitudes during the APES. Schutz defines the primary purposes of the FIRO-B as follows: "(1) To measure how an individual acts in interpersonal situations, and (2) to provide an instrument that will facilitate the prediction of interaction between people" (p. 4). In order to assess the teacher's relationship with others, the instrument identifies two aspects of behavior in each of the three areas: "The behavior an individual expresses toward others (e) and the behavior he wants others to express toward him (w)" (p. 4). The teacher's attitude toward self may be inferred from the relationship of scores on the six scales comprising the FIRO-B. Schutz defines the dimensions of the scales as follows:

> I. The interpersonal need for inclusion is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to interaction and association...
> C. The interpersonal need for control is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to control and power. Control behavior refers to the decision-making process between people...
> A. The interpersonal need for affection is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with others with respect to love and affection (pp. 4-5).

The FIRO-B is administered at the beginning and end of the APES. The pre- and post-test scores are treated to the appropriate statistical analyses to determine significant difference between the scores. In this manner the FIRO-B is used as a criterion measure of the effectiveness of the APES. A secondary analysis will show the influence of group development during the APES and the correlation between attitude toward self and teacher-candidate performance.

CONFERENCE OBSERVATION FORMS

During the teacher-candidate's internship he is observed by members of a supervisory team, including university professors, graduate assistants,

public school department chairpersons, supervising teachers, and teacher-candidate peers. Each member of the team completes observation forms which rate the candidate in the following areas: Pre-teaching preparation, Initiating behaviors, Mode of presentation, Learning activities, Classroom management, and Overall performance. The four-point rating scale is Superior, Adequate, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory These observation sheets (between 16-32 forms on each teacher-candidate at the present time) are then compiled and summarized on the Conference Observation Forms three times during the APES. The Observation Forms are used in formal evaluation conferences with the teacher-candidates. Since there are so many observations from a number of different people, rater reliability is not a factor. As a process evaluation, the teacher-candidate is made aware of areas of strengths and weaknesses; the emphasis here is on personal evaluation. The differences among the three summary sheets are used as a criterion measure to indicate the direction of change as a result of the effectiveness of the APES.

DEPARTMENTAL ENGLISH EDUCATION TEST

The departmental English Education Test is a 40-item knowledge test developed by the Secondary English Committee. Each item corresponds to a specific goal or objective of the program. The test, administered at the end of the APES, attempts to evaluate the success of the program based on the knowledge of the graduates.

INVENTORY OF STUDENT PERCEPTION OF INSTRUCTION

The Inventory of Student Perception of Instruction (ISPI) is an instrument developed by Owen Scott and Ramon Veal to ascertain student perception of six generalized aspects of instruction: Instructional

objectives, Classroom human relations, Use of instructional resources, Student motivation for learning, and Measurement and evaluation. The Inventory contains 74 statements to which students express a degree of agreement or disagreement. Each statement is related to one of the generalized areas and rated on a scale from 1.00 to 4.00. As a measure of the effectiveness of the program, the mean score for each generalization is computed. A mean score below 2.5 may indicate that there is a specific omission or deficiency in the program. Of course, means larger than 2.5 suggest that the preparation program is helping teacher-candidates to develop the specific competencies indicated by the ISPI generalizations, and means larger than 3.0 strongly indicate that such is the case. All of the generalized areas correspond to the goals and objectives and to the performance observations. In addition to the program evaluation, ISPI can be used for teacher-candidate self-evaluation or for a comparison of pupil perception with the teacher-candidate's perception expressed in the attitude measures.

TEACHER-CANDIDATE PROGRAM EVALUATION

The departmental Teacher-Candidate Program Evaluation form is a direct attempt to gather feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The instrument is a rating scale of both the content of courses and the quality of instruction in these courses.

FOLLOW-UP STUDY

The follow-up study will include an attitudes questionnaire and observations of first-year teachers who completed the APES in the spring of 1975.

Although several groups of students have completed the program at various stages of its development, only one group of twelve students has completed the entire evaluation design. Of these twelve students, ten completed the program in English education and two were liberal arts students completing certification requirements. The principal difference between these two types of students is the inclusion of the capstone courses in the programs of the ten students in English education. Although the group is a small sample and the results are limited, this group can be compared with former students who were in the traditional program. The results may be predictive of the results to be found in larger samples.

On the attitude measures there is no significant difference in pre- and post-test scores. There is one important difference within the group: Students who have completed the English education program score significantly higher on the MTAI than do the liberal arts students. There was no significant difference on the FIRO-B, which seems to indicate that these attitudes are rather stable over a short period of time.

The Conference Observation Forms show that there is improvement in nearly every area from the first form to the third form. On the departmental English Education test, those students who had completed the program in English education scored higher than the liberal arts students.

On the Teacher-Candidate Program Evaluation the difference between favorable and unfavorable responses from teacher-candidates in the field centers and student-teachers in the traditional program were significant on a chi square test at the .01 level for the following areas: Content in the method courses, Quality of Instruction in the method courses,

Content in the internship, and Quality of Instruction in the internship. There was no significant difference in responses for the on-campus major courses taken prior to the APES.

Although the ISPI was administered to the pupils of these teacher-candidates, the results are not available at present. And, of course, the follow-up study has not been completed.

Overall, there seem to be two important aspects of this evaluation design. First, the evaluation of the teacher-candidates is continuous. Secondly, the evaluation includes measures of attitudes, knowledge, and performance, as well as pupil perception, self-evaluation of the program by the teacher-candidates themselves. Of the first three measures above, the general indication is that students who score highest on one measure tend to score highest on the other measures. In addition, those students who have completed the total program in English education score higher than those students who have not.